	Case 3:07-cv-05349-FDB Document 10	Filed 08/20/07	Page 1 of 2	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA			
8		 		
9	WILLIAM G. MOORE,			
10	Petitioner,	Case No. (		
11	V.	(	CR95-5415	
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		DENYING MOTION FOR IDERATION	
13	Respondent.			
14				
15				
16				
17	This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner William G. Moore's Motion for			
18	Reconsideration the Court's Order of August 8, 2007, denying Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus			
19	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. The Court, having considered the Petitioner's pleadings and the			
20	balance of the record, finds that the motion should be denied.			
21	Pursuant to Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored,			
22	and will ordinarily be denied unless there is a showing of (a) manifest error in the prior ruling, or (b)			
23	facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier,			
24	through reasonable diligence. Petitioner has not made the requisite showing as to either of the			
25	grounds for reconsideration under CR 7(h)(1). Initially, Petitioner Moore requests the Court			
26	ORDER - 1			

## Case 3:07-cv-05349-FDB Document 10 Filed 08/20/07 Page 2 of 2

1	consider a Supplement to the Memorandum in Support of his habeas petition. Petitioner is under the			
2	false impression that this supplement was filed subsequent to the Court's consideration of the habeas			
3	petition. These materials were filed with the Court on August 2, 2007, and taken under			
4	consideration prior to the Court's August 3, 2007 Order. Regarding Petitioner's further argument,			
5	Petitioner attempts to use this motion to revisit the factual and legal arguments made in support of			
6	the petition. The Court is not persuaded by this reargument. Petitioner's motion does not			
7	demonstrate a manifest error in the Court's prior ruling dismissing the petition nor does it provide			
8	the Court with any new information not previously considered.			
9	CONCLUSION			
10	For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration will be denied. <b>DENIED</b> .			
11	ACCORDINGLY,			
12	IT IS ORDERED:			
13	(1) Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt #8] is <b>DENIED</b> .			
14	(2) The Court will not consider any further pleadings filed in this matter.			
15	DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007.			
16				
17				
18				
19	FRANKLIN D. BURGESS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

26 ORDER - 2